



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,268	10/19/2000	Saligrama R. Venkatesh	2874	5269

27377 7590 05/18/2005

MACMILLAN, SOBANSKI & TODD, LLC
ONE MARITIME PLAZA-FOURTH FLOOR
720 WATER STREET
TOLEDO, OH 43604

EXAMINER

LAO, LUN S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/692,268

Applicant(s)

VENKATESH

Examiner

Lun-See Lao

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Introduction

1. Claims 1-17 of U.S. Application 09/692,268 filed on 10-19-2000 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Regarding claims 1,6,11,13, the phrase "or" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or "), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGregor (US PAT. 4,965,833) in view of Romesburg (US PAT. 5,796,819).

Consider claim 11, McGregor teaches that a user interface for a cabin communication system for improving clarity of a voice spoken within an interior cabin having at least first and second seat locations (see figs1-2), wherein the cabin

Art Unit: 2643

communication system includes a first microphone (6) for receiving a first spoken voice from the first seat location and a first loudspeaker for outputting a first reproduced voice at the first seat location, and a second microphone (9) for receiving a second spoken voice from the second seat location and a second loudspeaker (7) for outputting a second reproduced voice at the second seat location, the cabin communication system ; but McGregor does not teach that acoustic echo cancellation to eliminate feedback echos between the microphones and the loudspeakers.

However, Romesburg teaches that acoustic echo cancellation to eliminate feedback echos between the microphones and the loudspeakers (see figs 8-9 and col. 14 line 41-col.15 line 22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Romesburg in to McGregor to provide the desired level of echo suppression without the expense of high quality audio components.

McGregor teaches the user interface comprising:

a first interface section including a first plurality of manual controls accessible from the first seat location, said first plurality of manual controls including a first control for connecting and disconnecting the first microphone (see fig. 2, 66) to the second loudspeaker (7) so that the first spoken voice is or is not output as the respective second voice at the second seat location, and a second control for connecting and disconnecting the first loudspeaker (10) to the second microphone (9) so that the

Art Unit: 2643

respective second spoken voice at the second seat location is or is not output as the first reproduced voice (see col.3 line 34-col.4 line 68); and

a second interface section including a second plurality of manual controls accessible from the second seat location, said second plurality of manual controls including a third control for connecting and disconnecting the second microphone (see fig.2, 9) to the first loudspeaker (6) so that the second spoken voice is or is not output as the first reproduced voice at the first seat location, and a fourth control for connecting and disconnecting the second loudspeaker (9) to the first microphone(6) so that the first spoken voice at the first seat location is or is not output as the second reproduced voice (see col.3 line 34-col.4 line 68).

Consider claim 1, McGrego does not clearly teach a third interface section including a third plurality of manual controls accessible from the third seat location, third first plurality of manual controls including a fifth control for connecting and disconnecting the third microphone to a selected one of the first and second loudspeakers so that the third spoken voice is or is not output as the respective first or second reproduced voice at the respective first or second seat location, and a sixth control for connecting and disconnecting the third loudspeaker to a selected one of the first or second microphones so that the respective first or second spoken voice at the respective first or second seat location is or is not output as the third reproduced voice. ^{However,} ~~Therefore,~~ it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the third interface section, since it has been held that mere duplication of the

Art Unit: 2643

essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ8. and see the previous claim 11 rejection.

Consider claims 2-5 and 12, McGregor teaches the user interface of the first microphone (see fig.2, 6) directionally receives the first spoken voice from the first seat location and said second microphone(9) directionally receives the second spoken voice from the second seat and the third spoken voice from the third seat location (see figs 1-2); and the user interface of the first control optionally connects the first microphone(6) to the second loudspeaker(7) and said second control optionally connects the first loudspeaker to the second microphone(9) (see fig.2 and col.3 line 34-col.4 line 68); and the user interface of the third control optionally connects the second microphone(9) to the first loudspeaker(10) and said fourth control optionally connects the second loudspeaker(7) to the first microphone(6)(see fig.2 and col.3 line 34-col.4 line 68).

On the other hand, MaGregor does not clearly teach that connecting and disconnecting for third row of speaker and microphone and the user interface of the fifth control optionally connects the third microphone to both of the first and second loudspeakers and said sixth control optionally connects the third loudspeaker to both of the first and second microphones. However, MaGregore indicate how to disconnecting and connecting the first row and second row of the microphones and speakers.

~~However~~
Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the third interface section, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ8.

6. Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGregor (US PAT. 4,965,833) as modified by Romesburg (US PAT. 5,796,819) as applied to claim 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Monopoli (US PAT. 6,192,135).

Consider claim 13, McGregor teaches the user interface of further comprising: a first (see fig.2,12) switch for making connection between the first microphone (6) and the second loudspeaker (7), said first switch (12) making the connection or breaking the connection in response to a most recent actuation of said first and fourth controls; and a second three-way switch (12) for making connection between the second microphone (9) and the first loudspeaker (10), said second switch making the connection or breaking the connection in response to a most recent actuation of said second and third controls (see col.3 line 13-col.4 line 47); but McGregor does not clearly teach a three-way switch.

However, Monopoli teaches a three-way switch (see fig.3 , 273 and col.3 line 23-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Monopoli into the teaching of Romesburg and McGregor to provide a master of ceremonies can use a three-way switch for switching each of the microphones to the headphones and loudspeakers.

Consider claim 6, McGregor, and Romesburg do not teach a third three-way switch for making connection between the second microphone and the first loudspeaker, said third switch making the connection or breaking the connection in response to a most

Art Unit: 2643

recent actuation of said second and third controls, a fourth three-way switch for making connection between the second microphone and the third loudspeaker, said fourth switch making the connection or breaking the connection in response to a most recent actuation of said third and sixth controls; a fifth three-way switch for making connection between the third microphone and the first loudspeaker, said-fifth switch making the connection or breaking the connection in response to a most recent actuation of said second and fifth controls; and a sixth three-way switch for making connection between the third microphone and the second loudspeaker, said sixth switch making the connection or breaking the connection in response to a most recent actuation of said fourth and fifth controls. ^{However,} ~~Therefore,~~ it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the third interface section, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ8. and see the previous claim 13 rejection.

7. Claims 7-8 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGregor (US PAT. 4,965,833) as modified by Romesburg (US PAT. 5,796,819) as applied to claim 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Iwai (JP 57008995).

Consider claims 7 and 14, McGregor and Romesburg do not teach the user interface of further comprising a voice storage device for storing voice messages and a voice storage logic device for controlling access to said voice storage device to record voice messages therein at accessible locations,

said first interface section including a seventh control for controlling said voice storage logic device to store in said voice storage device a voice message received at the first microphone, and an eighth control for controlling said voice storage logic device to retrieve from said voice storage device a recorded voice message to be output by the first loudspeaker,

said second interface section including a ninth control for controlling said voice storage logic device to store in said voice storage device a voice message received at the second microphone, and a tenth control for controlling said voice storage logic device to retrieve from said voice storage device a recorded voice message to be output by the second loudspeaker, and

said third interface section including an eleventh control for controlling said voice storage logic device to store in said voice storage device a voice message received at the third microphone, and a twelfth control for controlling said voice storage logic device to retrieve from said voice storage device a recorded voice message to be output by the third loudspeaker.

However, Iwai teaches said first interface section including a seventh control for controlling said voice storage logic device (see fig.1) to store in said voice storage device a voice message received at the first microphone (1), and an eighth control for controlling said voice storage logic device to retrieve from said voice storage device a recorded voice message to be output by the first loudspeaker (11)(see abstract),

On the other hand, Iwai does not teaches said second interface section including a ninth control for controlling said voice storage logic device to store in said voice storage

Art Unit: 2643

device a voice message received at the second microphone, and a tenth control for controlling said voice storage logic device to retrieve from said voice storage device a recorded voice message to be output by the second loudspeaker, and

said third interface section including an eleventh control for controlling said voice storage logic device to store in said voice storage device a voice message received at the third microphone, and a twelfth control for controlling said voice storage logic device to retrieve from said voice storage device a recorded voice message to be output by the

third loudspeaker, ^{However,} ~~Therefore,~~ it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the third interface section, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ8.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Iwai into the teaching of Romesburg and McGregor to provide integrated digital storage in a record and playback device having efficient bus interface bus.

Consider claims 8 and 15, Iwai teaches the user interface of each, said eighth, tenth and twelfth controls can control said voice storage logic device to retrieve any voice message stored in said voice storage device (see fig.1 and abstract and constitution and previous rejection 7 and 14).

Art Unit: 2643

8. Claims 16-17 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGregor (US PAT. 4,965,833) as modified by Romesburg (US PAT. 5,796,819) as applied to claim 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Roddy (US PAT. 6,363,156).

Consider claims 16-17 and 10 McGregor and Romesburg does not clearly teach the user interface of further comprising a wireless telephone for making a call to a remote location and receiving a call from a remote location, said first interface section including a fifth control for accessing said telephone for making and placing a-call, and said second interface section including a sixth control for accessing said telephone for making and placing a call; and the user interface of the sixth and seventh controls enable simultaneous access to said wireless telephone for joint participation in a call.

However, Roddy teaches the user interface of further comprising a wireless telephone for making a call to a remote location and receiving a call from a remote location, said first interface section including a fifth control for accessing said telephone for making and placing a-call, and said second interface section including a sixth control for accessing said telephone for making and placing a call (see 2 and col. 3 line 7-col. 4 line 23); and the user interface of the sixth and seventh controls enable simultaneous access to said wireless telephone for joint participation in a call (see 2 and col. 3 line 7-col. 4 line 23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Roddy into the teaching of Romesburg and McGregor to provide passengers with control of vehicle subsystems

Art Unit: 2643

such as an audio entertainment or cellular phone subsystems to eliminate tasks demanded of the operator.

Consider claim 9, McGregro and Romesburg does not teach the third interface section including a ninth control for accessing said telephone for making and placing a call. ^{However,} ~~Therefore,~~ it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the third interface section, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ8. and see the previous claim 16 rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hadley (US PAT. 5,243,640); and Komoda (US PAT. 5,604,799) are recited to show other related the user interface for communication system.

10. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop ____ (explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Facsimile responses should be faxed to:
(703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314


Art Unit: 2643

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lao,Lun-See whose telephone number is (571) 272-7501. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz, can be reached on (571) 272-7499.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Lao,Lun-See
Patent Examiner
US Patent and Trademark Office
Crystal Park 2
571-272-7501


DUC NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER